

**United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT**

No. 96-3538MN

United States of America,	*	
	*	
Appellee,	*	Appeal from the United States
	*	District Court for the
v.	*	District of Minnesota.
	*	
Lorenzo Martin Devine,	*	[UNPUBLISHED]
	*	
Appellant.	*	

Submitted: March 14, 1997

Filed: March 26, 1997

Before McMILLIAN, FAGG, and LOKEN, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM.

Lorenzo Martin Devine appeals the district court's order revoking Devine's supervised release and imposing a term of imprisonment followed by a period of supervised release. In a brief filed under Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), counsel contends Devine's revocation hearing was untimely under Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 32.1(a)(2). The record does not support counsel's contention, see United States v. Blunt, 680 F.2d 1216, 1219 (8th Cir. 1982), and Devine suffered no prejudice from the delay before his federal revocation hearing, see United States v. Chaklader, 987 F.2d 75, 76-77 (1st Cir. 1993) (per curiam); cf. United States v. Smith, 80 F.3d 1188, 1191-92 (7th Cir. 1996). Counsel also contends the district court lacked authority to impose a punishment that combined imprisonment and supervised release on

revocation of Devine's original supervised release term; however, this argument is foreclosed by our decision in United States v.

Love, 19 F.3d 415, 416 (8th Cir.), cert. denied, 115 S. Ct. 434 (1994). Based on our review of the record, we find no nonfrivolous issue for appeal. See Penson v. Ohio, 488 U.S. 75, 80 (1988). We thus affirm the district court.

A true copy.

Attest:

CLERK, U.S. COURT OF APPEALS, EIGHTH CIRCUIT.